

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULES AND)	ADMINISTRATIVE
RELATED FILINGS CONCERNING INTRA-)	CASE NO. 354
LATA EQUAL ACCESS COMPETITION)	

O R D E R

On September 15, 1995, Salem Telephone Company ("Salem") applied for a waiver of equal access requirements specified in Administrative Case No. 323.¹ Although the application was filed in that case, Administrative Case No. 323 was closed by final Order of the Commission and Administrative Case No. 354 was initiated to consider implementation of that Order. Therefore, the application will be filed in that case. Further, the Commission finds that additional information is necessary.

IT IS ORDERED that Salem shall file the original and ten copies of the following information with the Commission with a copy to all parties of record within 20 days from the date of this Order. Salem shall furnish the name of the witness who will respond at the public hearing, if one is held, to questions concerning each item of information.

1. What are the type, vendor, and version of the switch located in Salem's central office?

¹ Administrative Case No. 323, An Inquiry Into IntraLATA Toll Competition, An Appropriate Compensation Scheme for Completion of IntraLATA Calls by Interexchange Carriers and WATS Jurisdictionality.

2. What is the current software generic used in the switch?
3. What services are currently provided using the software?
4. What services not yet offered or activated could be provided by the switch?
5. What amount of incremental investment would be required to provide intraLATA equal access simultaneous with interLATA equal access?
6. In the event the waiver is granted, at what date would Salem propose to implement intraLATA equal access?
7. What additional local exchange services could Salem offer its customers if it installed a software upgrade capable of providing intraLATA equal access?
8. Has Salem had any requests from its customers for intraLATA equal access? If so, how has Salem responded to these requests?
9. If no requests have been made and such requests are made prior to intraLATA equal access conversion, how does Salem propose to respond to its customers?
10. Has Salem had any requests from interexchange carriers for intraLATA equal access conversion? If so, how has Salem responded to these requests?

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 2nd day of November, 1995.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Robert M. Davis
By the Commission

ATTEST:

Don Mills
Executive Director